

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 28, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, and 16-20 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, and 16-19 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present application. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the claims add no new subject matter to the present application and serves only to place the present application in better condition for examination. Therefore, entry of the amendments and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, and 16-20 are respectfully requested. In particular, it is believed that all grounds for rejection in the Office Action have been addressed and that the present application is currently in condition for allowance in view of the amendment and the following arguments.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102(e)/103(a)

The Office Action alleged following art-based rejections:

- Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20060050680 (Naim).

- Claims 2, 11, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Naim in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,259 (Pecen).
- Claims 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Naim in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,871,070 (Ejzak).

Accordingly, Applicants note that the pending claims are all currently rejected over Naim by itself or in combination with another cited references. Naim claims priority to US Provisional Application No. 60/372,529 filed on April 15, 2002. The Office Action specifically cited to Naim at paragraphs [0065]-[0067] as allegedly anticipating and disclosing at least the following recitations from the independent claim 1 (and related recitations in independent claims 10 and 19):

- the module configured to enable at least one core network application to run;
- the module configured to enable the core network application to run in parallel with at least one of the plurality of access network applications;
- the user identification module configured to generate authentication data for a core network and the access network; and
- the authentication data for said core network and the access network being further configured to be dependent on a common data set comprising at least one shared key between the access network and the access network application or the core network application and wherein the shared key is configured to generate a required session key or keys.

While Applicants do not admit the relevance of these paragraphs with respect to paragraphs [0065]-[0067] of Naim, Applicants respectfully note that these paragraphs

cited in the Office Action or equivalent paragraphs are not found within U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/372,529. Therefore, at least the portions of Naim cited in the Office Action cannot claim a priority date of April 15, 2002.

Instead, this disclosure cited in the Office Action does not appear until the filing of PCT Application No. PCT/US03/11573 on April 14, 2003, from which Naim also claim priority. Therefore, the cited paragraphs in Naim can only claim priority, at the earliest, to the PCT filing date of April 14, 2003.

Applicants further note that the present application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application, 60/462,102 filed on April 11, 2003, before the PCT filing date of Naim. Therefore, the portion of Naim used in the Office Action to allegedly anticipate multiple recitations of the pending independent claims is not citable prior art against the present application under 35 U.S.C §102(e).

Applicants therefore respectfully urge that Naim did not disclose any relevant subject matter prior to the priority date of the present application. Moreover, Applicants forward that the disclosure found within the U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/372,529, from which Naim claims priority, does not anticipate the pending claims in the present application.

On at least these grounds, Applicants urge that that the pending art-based rejection in view of Naim by itself or in combination with other references, is legally incorrect and must be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and their dependent claims 2, 5, 7-9, 11, 16-18, and 20 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, and 16-20 recites allowable subject matter and that all grounds for rejection/objection to the pending application have been addressed in this Response. It is therefore respectfully requested that these pending rejections be withdrawn, and this application be passed to issue with the allowance of pending independent claims 1, 10, and 19 and the claims the depend therefrom.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

David D. Nelson  
Registration No. 47,818

**Customer No. 32294**  
**SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP**  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

DDN/cqc

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time  
Check No. 018366